

*Comments from:*  
**Judy Aron**  
**40 North Quaker Lane,**  
**West Hartford CT 06119**  
**860-523-7257**

**PUBLIC HEARING**  
**Public Safety and Security Committee**  
**Thursday, March 3, 2011 at 10 am.**  
**Room 1E LOB.**

**To Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee:**

I am sending this testimony to you to Support each of these bills:

- **H.B. 6377 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARMS PREEMPTION** - Those that regularly carry around the State, or that live in certain towns with unreasonable ordinances need preemption to be protected from localities that attempt to create laws that counter state statute. It is wrong for municipalities to prevent people from exercising the rights that our State Statute and State Constitution affords them.
- **H.B. 6376 (RAISED) AN ACT ELIMINATING THE REQUIREMENT OF A BOOK RECORDING EACH SALE OF A PISTOL OR REVOLVER** - HB6376 will very simply reduce some of the redundancy that affects sellers and purchasers of firearms. The paperwork is costly, time consuming and creates unnecessary processing work. The system should be made more efficient.
- **S.B. 966 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS TO SELL FIREARMS** - SB966 will allow an easier transaction process at gun shows and exhibits between sellers and purchasers. Free commerce should be allowed at these venues, especially as the laws regarding the sale of firearms and the paperwork necessary to complete a transaction would already be adhered to.
- **S.B. 967 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR A TEMPORARY STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR A REVOLVER** - Many Local issuing authorities take great liberty in requesting documents and information that go well beyond what State Law requires for the issuance of a Permit to Carry Pistols/Revolvers. This legislation if passed into law for force towns and cities to have uniformed criteria to issue a temporary permit, thereby eliminating many hurdles for applicants.

In particular reference to SB967, please look at the map attached to see some of the more egregious towns in CT which have been asking for/demanding information from permit applicants which is not required by statute. There are actually more towns than I have outlined. It is not right that permit applicants are asked for more than what is required by statute. They ask for credit information, certified reference letters, bank statements, and a host of other documentation that is absolutely not required to obtain a permit. They also make the applicant wait several months when the process should only take eight weeks. These towns should have to adhere to a standard for permit application. I would even add a provision for municipalities to be fined for purposefully obstructing an applicant from obtaining a permit. There are many people whose right to obtain a permit has been intentionally made more cumbersome.

**Please support these bills.**  
**Thank You For Your Time,**

**Judy Aron**

